



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,294	04/02/2001	Chil-Yong Kang	9611-16	4835

1059 7590 10/22/2003

BERESKIN AND PARR
SCOTIA PLAZA
40 KING STREET WEST-SUITE 4000 BOX 401
TORONTO, ON M5H 3Y2
CANADA

EXAMINER

PARKIN, JEFFREY S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1648

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/762,294

Applicant(s)

KANG ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) g.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Office Action

Status of the Claims

1. Applicants' election of Group I (claims 1-21) in paper no. 11 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the purported errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without
5 traverse (refer to M.P.E.P. § 818.03(a)).

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point
10 out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The reference to a "non-cytolytic" recombinant virus, wherein said properties stem from removal of the cytolytic natural signal sequence, is vague and indefinite. It is not readily manifest to which specific regions of the HIV-1 Env the
15 claims are directed. For instance, the HIV-1 Env contains a number of hydrophobic sequences that facilitate transport of the nascent peptide across the lumen of the ER during translation and the insertion of the TMP region into the lipid bilayer. Thus, it is not readily manifest which signal sequences are encompassed
20 by the claim language. Appropriate correction is required.

35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

25 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most
30 nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to
5 make and/or use the invention. The claims are directed toward vaccine compositions and methods of preventing or treating viral infection through the administration of a recombinant HIV-1 virus wherein the natural signal sequence has been replaced by a heterologous signal sequence.

10 The legal considerations that govern enablement determinations pertaining to undue experimentation have been clearly set forth. *Enzo Biochem, Inc.*, 52 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (C.A.F.C. 1999). *In re Wands*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1400 (C.A.F.C. 1988). *Ex parte Forman* 230 U.S.P.Q. 546 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. Int., 1986). The courts concluded
15 that several factual inquiries should be considered when making such assessments including the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those
20 in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims. *In re Rainer*, 52 C.C.P.A. 1593, 347 F.2d 574, 146 U.S.P.Q. 218 (1965). The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to a number of these considerations as follows:

25 1) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the correlates of protective immunity that are required for a protective or therapeutic immune response. In order to practice the claimed invention, the skilled artisan would require a knowledge of the correlates of protective immunity in order to
30 assess if the vaccine composition of interest is producing the desired immune response. However, the disclosure is silent concerning this aspect of vaccine development and it is not readily

manifest what type of immune response (i.e., humoral, cell-mediated, or both) is required for protection and therapeutic immune responses.

2) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the quasispecies nature of HIV-1 infection. The vast genotypic and phenotypic diversity of HIV-1 means that any putative vaccine must be capable of neutralizing a number of different isolates, strains, and clades in order to be effective. However, the specification fails to provide any guidance pertaining to this subject.

3) The disclosure fails to provide any data from an art-recognized animal model demonstrating that the claimed vaccine compositions are truly effective immunogens. Before administering the claimed compositions, the skilled artisan would require a demonstration that said compositions were capable of inducing the desired immune response in the intended host.

4) The prior art teaches that HIV-1 vaccine development is extremely unpredictable (Haynes et al., 1996; Haynes, 1996; Burton and Moore, 1998; Letvin, 1998; Lee, 1997). To date there are no FDA-approved vaccines for the prevention or treatment of HIV-1 infection. This is due to several factors including the lack of understanding of the correlates of protective immunity, the lack of adequate animal models in which to assess vaccine efficacy, and the quasispecies nature of HIV-1 infection.


Accordingly, when all the aforementioned factors are considered in toto, it would clearly require undue experimentation from the skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention.

Correspondence

5. Correspondence related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Official communications should be directed toward the following Group 1600 fax number: (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-

5 2227. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors, Laurie Scheiner or James Housel, can be reached at (703) 308-1122 or (703) 308-4027, respectively. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Respectfully,



Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1648

19 October, 2003